

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. 10/649,927 08/25/2003 Radovan Kovacevic 021791.0112 6116 5073 10/20/2004 **EXAMINER** BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. EVANS, GEOFFREY S 2001 ROSS AVENUE ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 600** 1725 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
Office Action Summary	10/649,927	KOVACEVIC ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Geoffrey S Evans	1725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ate, cause the application to become AB.	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. (HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and.	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to th			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		, ,	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority.	nts have been received. nts have been received in Ap onty documents have been	oplication No	
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	aceived .	**
Oco the attached detailed Office activit for a list	or or the certified cobies (10) i	cociyeu.	
Attachment(s)	· .		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ımmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
 Foliate of Diantsperson's Fatent Drawing Review (F10-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20031229. 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 1. Please note in claim 12 there is no antecedent basis for "the infrared camera". Please correct.
- 2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1,2,11,16, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fehrmann et al. in WO 03/070414 A1, filed 10 February 2003. Fehrmann et al. discloses a method for controlling the size of the molten pool by imaging with a CCD camera (e.g. see page 5,line 27) to determine the temperature of the molten pool. This temperature information is used to control the laser power (e.g. see page 10, lines 20-22). Fehrmann et al. further discloses using software tools for this control system (see page 10, last 3 lines) and accomplishing control of the laser based manufacturing process in real time (e.g. see page 10,lines 23-24). Regarding claim 2, Fehrmann et al. discloses that the powder (8) injection is concentric with respect to the cone of captured optical signals (13) from the melt zone (e.g. see claim 16).

Application/Control Number: 10/649,927

Art Unit: 1725

Page 3

- 4. Claims 1, 6,8,9,10,11,14-16,24,25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koch et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,122,564. Koch discloses imaging with an imaging device (TV camera 420) a molten pool on a substrate, comparing a physical dimension of the melt pool with a desired target size, and controlling the laser power (see column 7,lines 54-58) in a closed loop manner by using a CAD system to correlate the actual melt pool size with the target size. Regarding claims 6 and 8, Koch discloses a neutral density filter before the camera (see column 6,lines 3-6).
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 2,7,17, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,122,564 in view of Jasper et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,311,099. Jasper et al. teaches that the melt of the bath is easily detectable with as little interference as possible in the near infrared (820nm to 1050 nm) using a CCD camera (see column 5,lines 3-21) by using filters. It would have been obvious to adapt Koch et al. in view of Jasper et al. to provide this to detect the geometry of the melt bath with as little interference as possible.
- 7. Claims 3, 4,18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Koch et al. in view of Jasper et al. as applied to claims 2 and 17 above and further in view of Hu et al. in the article "Improving solid freeform fabrication by laser-based

Art Unit: 1725

additive manufacturing". Hu et al. teaches using an IR CCD camera that has a frame rate up to 800 frames per second (see figure 4 and the first column of page 1257). It would have been obvious to adapt Koch et al. in view of Jasper et al. and Hu et al. to provide this to acquire images for real time processing.

- 8. Claims 5,6,8,12,13,17,20,21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch et al. in view of Hu et al. in the article "Improving solid freeform fabrication by laser-based additive manufacturing". Hu et al. teaches using an infrared camera with a high frame rate charge and an imaging resolution of 128x128 (see figure 4 and the first column of page 1257). It would have been obvious to adapt Koch et al. in view of Hu et al. to provide this to obtain adequate resolution of the melt pool geometry.
- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Buchin et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,638,787 has a high frame rate CCD imaging device. Owaki et al. in Japan Patent No. 11-179,578 has a camera (7) with a filter for monitoring the molten pool. Griffith et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,459,951 uses two cameras (see column 8,lines 42-45) for controlling laser power (see column 10,lines 15-32) in a laser fabrication system. Kim et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,188,041 has real time weld process monitoring.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30AM to 4:00 PM, alternate Fridays off.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,927

Art Unit: 1725

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571)-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)-872-9306.

GSE

Geoffrey S. Evans Primary Examiner Group 1700